

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,297	10/16/2001	Fred Buchali	Q66335	2046
23373	7590 10/05/20	5	EXAM	INER
	MION, PLLC	CURS, NA	CURS, NATHAN M	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			2633	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/977,297	BUCHALI, FRED		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Nathan Curs	2633		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1, cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 July</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
Disposition of Claims	•			
4)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2005 is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a)  All b)  Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>				
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary			
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/04.</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/977,297

Art Unit: 2633

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tremblay et al. (US Patent No. 4823360).

Regarding claim 1, Tremblay et al. disclose a receiver for receiving optically transmitted signals, the receiver comprising an optical/electrical converter (fig. 4, element 82), an electronic feedback filter (fig. 4, elements 90 and 102 and fig. 3, elements 42 and 48) and at least one eye monitor for determining a quality of a transmission link (fig. 4, element 26 and col. 5, lines 30-45), an output of the at least one eye monitor being connected to an input of the electronic feedback filter (fig. 4, element 102 and fig. 3, element Vopt), wherein the eye monitor comprises: first and second threshold-value decision elements for deciding a level of a data signal based on first and second threshold values (fig. 3, elements 40 and 44 and col. 4, lines 1-34 and col. 5, lines 1-7) which are set close to vertices of an eye opening of an eye diagram (figs. 1 and 2a-2c and col. 3, lines 20-46); first and second signal comparators for determining pseudo-errors by comparing decided signals output by the threshold-value decision elements with a signal altered by pseudo-errors (fig. 3, elements 52 and 54 and col. 4, lines 18-34); first and second integrators for integrating the pseudo-errors output by the first and second signal comparators to generate first and second internal control variables (fig. 3, elements 60, 64, 68 and 62, 66, 70 and col. 4, lines 18-34) and first and second regulators which correct the first and

Application/Control Number: 09/977,297

Art Unit: 2633

second threshold values based on comparisons between the first and second internal control variables and first and second setpoint values, respectively (fig. 3, elements Vref+ and Vref- and col. 4, lines 57-63 and col. 5, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 2, Tremblay et al. disclose a receiver according to claim 1, where the receiver comprises two eye monitors (fig. 3, elements 40, 46, 52, 56, 60, 64, 68 and elements 44, 50, 54, 58, 62, 66, 70), outputs of which are connected to the inputs of the electronic feedback filter (fig. 4, elements 102 and 90), the two eye monitors measuring the eye opening of the signal (fig. 3, elements V+ and V-) and outputting it as a parameter signal (fig. 3, element Vopt).

Regarding claim 3, Tremblay et al. disclose a high-speed eye monitor comprising: first and second threshold-value decision elements for deciding a level of a data signal based on first and second threshold values (fig. 3, elements 40 and 44 and col. 4, lines 1-34 and col. 5, lines 1-7) which are set close to vertices of an eye opening of an eye diagram (figs. 1 and 2a-2c and col. 3, lines 20-46); first and second signal comparators for determining pseudo-errors by comparing decided signals output by the threshold-value decision elements with a signal altered by pseudo-errors (fig. 3, elements 52 and 54 and col. 4, lines 18-34); first and second integrators for integrating the pseudo-errors output by the first and second signal comparators to generate first and second internal control variables (fig. 3, elements 60, 64, 68 and 62, 66, 70 and col. 4, lines 18-34) and first and second regulators which correct the first and second threshold values based on comparisons between the first and second internal control variables and first and second setpoint values, respectively (fig. 3, elements Vref+ and Vref- and col. 4, lines 57-63 and col. 5, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 6, Tremblay et al. disclose a method for measuring the eye opening of an eye diagram, the method comprising: determining garbled signal with two threshold values

which correspond approximately to vertices of the eye opening (figs. 2a-2c and col. 3, lines 34-46), generating a data signal with pseudo-errors and detecting pseudo-errors through comparison with a correct signal (fig. 3, elements 52 and 54 and col. 4, lines 1-34), and adding the pseudo-errors through integration (col. 4, lines 57-63 and col. 5, lines 1-7); comparing each of the pseudo-errors with a setpoint value (fig. 3, elements 64 and 66 and col. 4, lines 57-63 and col. 5, lines 1-7); and readjusting deviating quantities and generating a differential signal of the threshold values as a measurement value (col. 5, lines 30-37).

Regarding claim 7, Tremblay et al. disclose a method for determining a garbled signal, the method comprising: determining the signal with a feedback filter which makes decisions on the basis of set threshold values and on the basis of an already determined signal (fig. 3, element Vopt, 42 and 48 and col. 3, lines 47-68); determining an eye opening of the signal with two eye monitors which determine eye edges at vertices of the signal and supplying a result to a feedback filter as a parameter (figs. 2a-2c and col. 3, lines 20-46 and col. 5, lines 63-68); and setting the threshold values of threshold value decision elements in the feedback filter, the parameter being used for setting of the threshold values so that the signal is determined in the eye optimum (col. 3, lines 47-68).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tremblay et al. (US Patent No. 4823360) in view of Bulow (US Patent No. 6016379).

Art Unit: 2633

Regarding claim 4, Tremblay et al. disclose the high-speed eye monitor according to claim 3, but do not disclose that the setpoint values are superimposed by small-signal components. Bulow disclose using a variation device superimposed on the Q value-based control of the equalization circuit, in order to enable the equalization control to optimally adapt to changes in signal quality over time (fig. 1, element 9 and col. 4, lines 53-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a small-signal variation signal superimposed on the equalization control signal of Tremblay et al. in order to enable the equalization control to optimally adapt to changes in signal quality over time, as suggested by Bulow.

### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 3, 6 and 7, the applicant argues that in Tremblay, only one monitor is used to produce a single threshold level. However Tremblay clearly discloses two monitors producing two threshold levels (monitor 1: fig. 3, elements 40, 46, 52, 56, 60, 64, 68, producing threshold V+; and monitor two: fig. 3, elements 44, 50, 54, 58, 62, 66, 70, producing threshold V-). The applicant also argues that the eye opening is not measured; however Tremblay discloses measuring the eye opening in col. 5, lines 22-37, where "IQ" is the eye opening. The applicant also argues that Tremblay discloses that levels V+ and V- are predefined and not measured; however this assertion is not correct (see col. 3, lines 16-19 and fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 18-63).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to N. Curs whose telephone number is (571) 272-3028. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (from 9 AM to 5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan, can be reached at (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (800) 786-9199.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Application/Control Number: 09/977,297

Art Unit: 2633

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> JASON CHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 7

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600